The "Covering."

BY EDWARD MASON.

Elder H. B. Brumbaugh of the German Baptist church and one of the editors of their church paper, gives a new idea on the "cap" question—at least it is a new idea in the Dunkard theology. Concerning its origin he says:

The custom of women, under certain conditions, being covered, or veiled, seems to be a very old one, and to have originated in their accepted inferiority in the order of their creation. Their veiling was the sign used to express this inferiority and their consequent subjection to man as her superior, and man acknowledging Christ as his head or superior. "I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man."—*Paul.* On account of the custom being so old, and because of the significance named, Paul so strongly urged it upon Christian women, when in the act of praying or prophesying. Paul urges it not as a new thing, but as an old and well-established custom, that all good women were expected—more—compelled to accept, or suffer the consequences, which was the garb of a prostitute. Women of this kind were stripped of the veil; their hair cut off, and were turned out in the streets. To avoid so disgraceful a thing among Christian women as appearing in public or religious meetings, in the garb or semblance of prostitutes, he urges that they be veiled.

To substantiate his views he quotes Kitto, Clark, Bishop, Pierce, Scott, Doddudge and others. Then as an apology for the church adopting the cap in view of the veil he adds:

There can, however, be no doubt but what the veil that Paul recommends was the one then in use by the woman whom he addressed, and if the distinctive purpose for its use was that of showing order, subjection and propriety, any other covering having this distinguishing feature would answer the purpose. On this supposition the church has accepted the cap our sisters now wear, as a substitute for the veil, or in lieu of it.

Then he gives his views and the views of others as to its design. The matter is eventually summed up thus:

1. That women are to use it as a sign showing their willingness to be in subjection to man, especially while acting in a church capacity.
2. That she use it as a mark or token of respect or reverence to man, recognizing him as her superior in the order of creation, he being made first, and she being made for his pleasure and advantage.
3. That she use it as a power which elevates her to an equality with man in the exercising of religious duties and privileges.

He also gives an interpretation of the words "*Because of the Angels,*" which, as it contains nothing new from what we have often heard before, we will omit. Toward the close of the article, in answer to the question "Should this covering be worn all the time?" he answers:

The manner in which Paul gives the advice very plainly answers the question. The time for a woman to be covered or veiled, according to Paul's advice, is while praying and prophesying. In this there need be no doubt or misunderstanding, as the time is plainly and clearly specified. As the instructions are given to both sexes, what applies to a man being uncovered, applies to the woman being covered. Any covering or uncovering done outside of the time named must be attributed to custom, as Paul gives no instructions beyond this.

Now we do not expect to criticise the above. Indeed we admire the courage of the brother in so boldly advocating what he considers truth, in the face of the bungling and unreasonable interpretations as given by such a high dignitary of his church as R. H. Miller. How the two explanations can be reconciled we suppose will be the work of a future Annual Meeting.

We call the attention of our readers to the several points here made, and then let them draw their own inferences.

1. It was a *custom* in the first place.
2. It was a badge of servitude and the inferiority of woman.
3. It was a badge of respectability in those days, because the shorn head and bare face was a badge of infamy and immorality.
4. Then it was a mark to distinguish respectable women from those that were not respectable.
5. It was a *veil* to cover the whole head, face and all.

That the above five points are correct, there is no doubt, for substantial testimony can be adduced. Without that, a careful, unprejudiced and intelligent reading of Paul, with just a little knowledge of the condition of Corinth in his day must bring us to the above conclusions. We had long contemplated writing an article on this question, but I must confess that I considered the prejudice in favor of the old ideas of the "covering," imbibed from the old church was so strong, that I shrank from the task. But here we have the matter brought abruptly before us in the *Messenger*, and by one of its editors. Many of my friends know that I have differed materially from the accepted view of this "covering" question. Now I submit the following:

1. Corinth was a very wicked city, full of immorality and lewdness.
2. As we have seen in the East, the *veil* was a badge of womanhood—more a badge of her servitude and inferiority to man.
3. Because this badge was neglected by the women of Corinth, when they had become masculine in their dress and habits, taking part in the games, &c; and because in those days and under such circumstances, to the Jews and inhabitants of more moral Palestine, this abandoning of the veil was an evidence that the women unsexed themselves; and because they considered it a violation of prevailing custom and morality, Paul warns the sisters of the little church at Corinth, lest it be disgraced.
4. That Paul was dealing with a local trouble and custom. And had it not been for this danger of the sisters in the eves of the Eastern people disgracing the church, it is very doubtful whether we would have ever heard of the "covering" as it is called.
5. Mark the whole thing is based on the prevailing opinion of that age that woman was interior to man. That is the origin of the veil.
6. Christianity came to elevate woman to her original sphere for which God had created her as the companion and equal of man. In the presumption and tyranny that prevailed in the heart of man after the fall, and during the long centuries of human apostacy, woman was degraded as a slave and an inferior. The veil was the badge of this serfdom.
7. Christ never mentions this distinction between man and woman.

We shall expect sometime in the future to enlarge on this question.

Self-aggrandizement.

BY MARTIN SHIVELY.

It is an evident fact that man was created for a noble purpose, and that that purpose was not the mere gratification of his own desires.

In this vast world of ours, we see men and women engaged in every vocation of life, but at the same time, largely dependent upon each other. The merchant, the farmer, the mechanic all have their particular interests, and they also have common interests in life.

We are really "many men of many minds," but when an insult is offered to our nation, we all are ready to compel the offender to relent.

Here then, we see a union of minds, upon a thing directed against our common interest—and is not our souls salvation a general one? Why not then work together, to accomplish all the good possible.

There is a class of people, in every organization, who desire to rule the entire affair alone, and I think that prehaps we as a church, are not an exception, in this matter, and the consequence is that affairs do not always move along as pleasantly, as could be desired.

Our faculty of ambition, may be largely developed, and it is a very good thing in the proper place, but when it prompts us to elevate ourselves, as a model, it should have "less rope," for we are so apt to forget the relation we bear to our fellow man, and to our God.

We frequently hear from organizations, (and occasionally one comes under our observation) that are troubled by this evil and the result is, invariably, strife, envy, malice, and many other things all of which our Master has told us to abstain from.

Let us "put on the whole armor of Christ" and "run with patience *the race set before us*;" for united we may do great things for the cause, but divided we are destined to fall.

Christ and the Passover.

BY S. W. WILT.

In No. 43, present volume of the EVANGELIST, a brother has made an effort to establish it as a fact that Christ, did eat the legal Jewish Passover just before his crucifixion. I have read his essay over three times, but failed to be convinced that he is right. I shall take no exceptions to his quotations from the word; but there are some considerations and facts connected with the case that he overlooks or has not noticed. He has labored to establish a fact that we do not deny viz.: That the *killing* was on the 14th. He seems to have forgotten that they began their day at sunset, and in consequence of this had two evenings. The law said, "the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening." The marginal reading is, "*between the two evenings.*"

Again, the law says, *at the going down of the sun.* Now it is an undeniable fact that the going down of the sun was not on the first evening (the evening of the night) for it did not begin until sunset of the 13th. So the slaying time must have been the second evening of the 14th (the evening of the artificial day, or the day light) and continued until sunset the 14th, at the time when the 15th day began. There can be no time between the close of the 14th, and the beginning of the 15th, and it is morally impossible to eat it in the first evening of the 14th, and kill it on the second. Hence it must have been eaten in the first evening of the 15th.—Christ kept the law, hence could not have eaten the legal Jewish Passover in his last night with his disciples in as much as he was crucified on the 14th day of the month.—The lamb was the type, Christ the anti-type, and if Christ was not crucified and did not die at the legal time appointed for slaying the Passover, the type and anti-type did not meet in point of time, and that would overthrow our faith entirely.

In as much as the brother has failed in regard to the time of eating the Passover, it is not needful that I should follow him any further. Suffice it to say, as it regards his dispesition of John 19: 14, it misses the mark; and the rendering of George Campbell is not in accordance with the Greek. To fully lucidate the case would require more time than I have at present to spare, and in all probability would take up more space in the EVANGELIST than the editor would be disposed to grant. However if our brother can bring the slaying and eating of the legal Passover all upon the 14th day of the month and not conflict with the law as laid down in the word, we would be pleased to have him do it. If I am wrong I would like to get right.

Terra Alta, W. Va., Oct. 29, 1886.

Little Things.

How often are we apt to leave these "little things" undone, and wait for opportunities to present themselves, that we might perform some great work, or deeds of kindness.. Many misfortunes befall us, simply because we leave those "little things" undone which we should do

Christ performed deeds of kindness, both great and small; then why should we be so timid about performing those "little things" as they present themselves to as we pass on in life? And if we would perform them in the proper manner, I believe that they would be an auxiliary to the church and an advancement to the cause of our Lord and Master. There are always a great many indispensible "little things" that must be performed, or our church work would eventually be greatly demoralized. Then why should we defer them, and set upon the stool of "do nothing", and wait for an opportunity to revolutionize itself in such a manner that we might be permitted to perform some great work? If we would take things as they come, and perform them as they present themselves to us we would be better qualified to perform some greater work.

Little acts of kindness are not unbecoming; they are in a certain sense typical of what we *are*, and what we may be capable of doing in the future. Besides we are all capable of doing some little act of kindness, that might be the means of strengthening a weaker brother, or prehaps rescue some precious soul from the sins of the world.

I do not believe we can be neutral; we are either for or against Christ. Then with this thought before us let us, if we have not the talent to perform some great work, remember as we pass on in life, that we are capable of performing some "little act of kindness."

SAMUEL GARVER.

Homer, Ohio., Nov. 1, 1886.